

Serial No. 09/837,158
Docket No. ARC920000018US1

6

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 and 14-24 are all the claims presently pending in the application. Claim 24 has been added to claim additional features of the claimed invention.

It is noted that the claim amendments are made only for more particularly pointing out the invention, and not for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or for any statutory requirements of patentability. Further, Applicant specifically states that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

Claims 1, 12 and 14-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement and to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-6, 8, 11, 17-18 and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allan et al. ("Topic Detection and Tracking Pilot Study Final Report", Proc. of DARPA Broadcast News Transcription and Understanding Workshop, Feb. 1998) in view of Goldszmidt et al. ("A Probabilistic Approach to Full-Text Document Clustering" 1998, Technical Report ITAD-433-MS-98-044, SRI International).

Claims 7, 9-10, 15-16 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allan in view of Goldszmidt, and further in view of Yang et al. ("Learning Approaches for Detecting and Tracking News Events", 1999, IEEE Intelligent Systems).

These rejections are respectfully traversed in the following discussion.

I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION

The claimed invention (e.g., as recited in claim 1) is directed to a method (e.g., a computer-implemented method) for identifying relationships between text documents and structured variables pertaining to the text documents. The method includes generating a dictionary of keywords in the text documents, forming categories of the text documents using the dictionary and an automated algorithm, counting occurrences of the structured variables, the categories, and combinations of structured variable and categories for in the text documents. Importantly, the method also calculates probabilities of occurrences of the combinations of structured variables and categories to identify a relationship between the text documents and the structured variables.

Conventional methods of analyzing text documents cannot efficiently (e.g.,

Serial No. 09/837,158

7

Docket No. ARC920000018US1

automatically) identify interesting relationships between text documents (e.g., unstructured free-form text documents) and structured variables. Instead, words and phrases which frequently occur in the documents are plotted on a graph and users are required to determine for themselves whether an interesting relationship exists, which is labor intensive and time consuming (Application at page 1, line 17-page 2, line 1).

The claimed invention, on the other hand, calculates probabilities of occurrences of the combinations of structured variables and categories to identify a relationship between the text documents and the structured variables (Application at page 10, line 14-page 12, line 7). Thus, unlike conventional methods, the claimed invention can efficiently (e.g., automatically) identify interesting relationships between the structured variables and categories of text documents (Application at page 11, lines 10-11; page 23, lines 1-8).

III. THE 35 USC §112, FIRST AND SECOND PARAGRAPH REJECTIONS

The Examiner alleges that claims 1, 12 and 14-21 allegedly fail to comply with the enablement requirement and allegedly fail to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant submits, however, that these claims are clearly enabled and clearly point out and distinctly claim the invention.

Applicant would point out that the test of enablement under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, is whether one reasonably skilled in the art could make or use the invention from the disclosures in the patent coupled with information known in the art without undue experimentation (MPEP §2164.01). That is the specification need only contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such terms as to enable **one of ordinary skill in the art** to make and use the same **without undue experimentation**. That is, the invention does not need to be described in such terms to allow anyone to make and use the invention, and does not need to be described in such terms to allow the invention to be made **without any experimentation**.

The Examiner notes that the present Application gives examples of "structured variables" (e.g., time intervals), but complains that Applicant "never specifically defines the term in such a way as to distinguish it from multiple interpretations by the skilled artisan".

First, Applicant would point out that an Application is not required to expressly define each and every term in the claims. Indeed, the Application need only be written such that one

Serial No. 09/837,158
Docket No. ARC920000018US1

8

of ordinary skill in the art can read the Application to make and use the invention to enable the claims.

Second, Applicant would point out that the term "structured variable" (e.g., "structured data") is clear and easily understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. For example, Applicant would point out that the term "structured" may be defined as "having definite and highly organized structure" (e.g., see <http://wordnet.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?s=structured>). Thus, the term "structured variable" (e.g., "structured data") may be defined as a **variable (e.g., data) having a definite structure**.

Further, the term "structured variable" (e.g., structured data) is commonly used by those of ordinary skill in the art. For example, the term "unstructured data" may refer to information (e.g., emails, call center notes, etc.) which does not have a data structure which is easily readable by a machine (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Unstructured_data). Further, the term "structured data" (e.g., structured variables) may refer to data (e.g., day, month, year, etc.) which may be easily readable by a machine (e.g., having a structure which is helpful for a desired processing task).

In addition, as conceded by the Examiner, the Application provides several examples of "structured variables" (e.g., structured data) (e.g., Application at page 10, lines 15-17). Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly understand the term "structured variables" (e.g., structured data), and the claims are clearly enabled.

With respect to the 35 USC §112, second paragraph rejection, the Examiner alleges that it is unclear what the meaning of structured is, nor is it clear what the term variable refers to. However, as noted above, the term "structured variable (e.g., structured data) may refer to data (e.g., time intervals, etc.) which may be easily readable by a machine (e.g., having a structure which is helpful for a desired processing task).

Therefore, Applicant submits that the claimed invention including the term "structured variable" (e.g., structured data) is clearly defined and that the claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims clearly comply with the enablement requirement and clearly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

Serial No. 09/837,158

9

Docket No. ARC920000018US1

IV. THE ALLEGED PRIOR ART REFERENCES

A. The Allan and Goldszmidt Publications

The Examiner alleges Allan would have been combined with Goldszmidt to form the invention of claims 1-6, 8, 11, 13, 17-18 and 21-23. Applicant submits, however, that these references would not have been combined and even if combined, the combination would not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Allan discloses a method of event detection which is based on group average agglomerative text clustering, aiming the discovery of natural patterns of news stories over concepts (lexicon terms) and time. The method creates a hierarchical tree of clusters, with the top layer representing a rough division into general topics and the lower layers being a finer division into narrower topics and events (Allan at section 3.2, The CMU Approach).

Goldszmidt discloses a probabilistic approach to full-text document clustering which includes scoring document similarity based on probabilistic considerations. Similarity is scored according to the expectation of the same words appearing in two documents. The score enables the investigation of different smoothing methods for estimating the probability of a word appearing in a document, for purposes of clustering (Goldszmidt at Abstract).

Applicant respectfully submits that these references would not have been combined as alleged by the Examiner. Indeed, Allan is directed to a method of event detection which is based on group average agglomerative text clustering, whereas Goldszmidt is directed to a method which estimates the probability of a word appearing in a document, for purposes of document clustering. Thus, these references are completely unrelated, and no person of ordinary skill in the art would have considered combining these disparate references, absent impermissible hindsight.

Further, these references clearly do not teach or suggest their combination. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been so motivated to combine the references as alleged by the Examiner. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness.

Moreover, neither Allan, nor Goldszmidt, nor any alleged combination teaches or suggests a method for identifying relationships between text documents and structured variables pertaining to the text documents, which includes "*calculating probabilities of occurrences of said combinations of structured variables and categories to identify a relationship between said text documents and said structured variables*", as recited, for

Serial No. 09/837,158

10

Docket No. ARC920000018US1

example, in claims 1 and 23, and similarly recited in claims 14 and 17.

As noted above, unlike conventional methods of analyzing text documents in which words and phrases which frequently occur in the documents are plotted on a graph and users are required to determine for themselves whether an interesting relationship exists, the claimed invention, on the other hand, calculates probabilities of occurrences of the combinations of structured variables and categories to identify a relationship between the text documents and the structured variables (Application at page 10, line 14-page 12, line 7). Thus, unlike conventional methods, the claimed invention can efficiently (e.g., automatically) identify interesting relationships between the structured variables and categories of text documents (Application at page 11, lines 10-11; page 23, lines 1-8).

Clearly, these novel features are not taught or suggested by the cited references or their combination.

1. The Examiner has Failed to Respond to Applicant's Arguments and, thus, the Office Action is Incomplete

First, Applicant would point out that nowhere in the Office Action does the Examiner address the arguments that Applicant included in Amendment filed herein on April 26, 2005. Instead, the Examiner merely repeats the arguments that he included in the Office Action dated March 4, 2005.

For example, **nowhere does the Examiner respond to Applicant's argument that Goldszmidt teaches a document similarity metric (i.e., a similarity between documents), which is completely unrelated to the claimed invention which may involve looking for a correlation between some event in the document text (e.g., the occurrence of a text category or word), and some other structured variable (e.g., date of the document, author's country of origin, etc.).**

Applicant notes that the Examiner is required to answer all of the material traversed by Applicant. Indeed, Applicant would point out that MPEP §707.07(f) provides that "*where the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's argument and answer the substance of it*" (emphasis added).

Here, the Examiner has clearly failed to answer all of the material traversed by Applicant. Therefore, the Office Action is incomplete and **the Examiner must allow these claims or provide Applicant with another non-final Office Action in which the**

Serial No. 09/837,158
Docket No. ARC920000018US1

11

Examiner responds to all of Applicant's arguments.

2. Goldszmidt is Unrelated to the Claimed Invention

The Examiner again expressly concedes that Allan does not teach or suggest this feature on page 5 of the Office Action. The Examiner alleges that the feature is taught by Goldszmidt. However, the Examiner is incorrect.

Indeed, Applicant would again point out that the Examiner alleges only that "Goldszmidt teaches a similarity measure based on probability ... which measures the degree of overlap between pairs of documents" (Office Action at page 5). Thus, the Examiner is surprisingly attempting to equate "measuring the degree of overlap between pairs of documents" (as in Goldszmidt) with identifying a relationship between a text document and structured variables (e.g., structured data such as a day, month year, etc.).

That is, the Examiner is surprisingly attempting to equate a comparing "documents" with a identifying a relationship between text documents and structured variables (e.g., structured data). Clearly, this is completely unreasonable.

Indeed, Applicant respectfully demands that the Examiner provide some support, any support, for this ridiculous notion that comparing "documents" would be equated by one of ordinary skill in the art identifying a relationship between text documents and structured variables (e.g., structured data). Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner cannot find any such support and therefore, should recognize that his argument is completely unreasonable, and allow the claims without further undue delay to Applicant.

Again, Applicant would point out that Goldszmidt merely teaches a document similarity metric. Clearly, this document similarity metric does not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Indeed, the claimed invention is not necessarily intended to measure similarity between documents. Instead, an exemplary aspect of the claimed invention may involve looking for a correlation between some event in the document text (e.g., the occurrence of a text category or word) and some other structured variable (e.g., date of the document, author's country of origin, etc.).

The probability measure in the claimed invention is simply one way that the claimed invention may determine whether any relationship (e.g., correlation) might exist between two

Serial No. 09/837,158

12

Docket No. ARC920000018US1

supposedly independent variables (text and structure) and if so, what that correspondence is (e.g. certain words or phrases used more often at certain times than at other times).

Thus, Goldszmidt does not teach or suggest a method of identifying relationships **between text documents and structured variables** as in the claimed invention. Specifically, Goldszmidt does not teach or suggest a method which calculates probabilities of occurrences of the combinations of structured variables and categories to identify a relationship between the text documents and the structured variables.

Therefore, even assuming (arguendo) that these references would have been combined, and even assuming (arguendo) that the Examiner's allegations regarding the teachings of Goldszmidt are correct, the combination of Allan and Goldszmidt clearly does not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Therefore, Applicant submits that these references would not have been combined and even if combined, the combination would not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

B. The Yang Publication

The Examiner alleges Allan would have been combined with Goldszmidt, and that the alleged Allan/Goldszmidt would have been further combined with Yang to form the invention of claims 7, 9-10, 15-16 and 19-20. Applicant submits, however, that these references would not have been combined and even if combined, the combination would not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

Yang discloses a method for detecting and tracking news events. Specifically, the method allegedly extends existing supervised-learning and unsupervised-clustering algorithms to allow document classification based on the information content and temporal aspects of news events (Yang at page 32, middle and right columns).

Applicant respectfully submits that these references would not have been combined as alleged by the Examiner. Indeed, contrary to Allan and Goldszmidt, Yang is directed to a method of event detection and tracking. Thus, these references are unrelated, and no person of ordinary skill in the art would have considered combining these disparate references, absent impermissible hindsight.

Further, these references clearly do not teach or suggest their combination. Therefore,

Serial No. 09/837,158

13

Docket No. ARC920000018US1

Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been so motivated to combine the references as alleged by the Examiner. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to make a prima facie case of obviousness.

Moreover, neither Allan, nor Goldszmidt, nor Yang, nor any alleged combination teaches or suggests a method for identifying relationships between text documents and structured variables pertaining to the text documents, which includes "calculating probabilities of occurrences of said combinations of structured variables and categories to identify a relationship between said text documents and said structured variables", as recited, for example, in claims 1 and 23, and similarly recited in claim 17.

As noted above, unlike conventional methods of analyzing text documents in which words and phrases which frequently occur in the documents are plotted on a graph and users are required to determine for themselves whether an interesting relationship exists, the claimed invention can efficiently (e.g., automatically) identify interesting relationships between the structured variables and categories of text documents (Application at page 11, lines 10-11; page 23, lines 1-8).

Clearly, these novel features are not taught or suggested by Yang. Indeed, Applicant would point out that the Examiner is not attempting to rely on Yang as allegedly teaching this feature.

In fact, Yang is clearly unrelated to the claimed invention. Indeed, Yang states that the tasks of his method are "1. Segmenting speech-recognized TV and radio broadcasts into news stories, 2. Detecting events from unsegmented or segmented news streams, and 3. Tracking stories for particular events based on user-identified sample stories" (Yang at page 32, right hand column).

Thus, clearly, Yang does not identify as a task of his method, identifying a relationship between the text documents and the structured variables. Certainly, Yang does not teach or suggest identifying such a relationship by calculating probabilities of occurrences of the combinations of structured variables and categories. Thus, Yang clearly does not make up for the deficiencies of the alleged Allan and Goldszmidt combination.

Therefore, Applicant submits that these references would not have been combined and even if combined, the combination would not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

Serial No. 09/837,158
Docket No. ARC920000018US1

14

III. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-12 and 14-24, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Assignee's Deposit Account No. 09-0441.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 10/11/05

Phillip E. Miller, Esq.
Registration No. 46,060

McGinn & Gibb, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, VA 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that the foregoing was filed by facsimile with the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Examiner James Blackwell, Group Art Unit #2176 at fax number 571-273-8300 this 11th day of October, 2005.



Phillip E. Miller
Reg. No. 46,060